

STAFFORD COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012

The meeting of the Stafford County Agricultural and Purchase of Development Rights Committee for Tuesday, February 28, 2012, was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Vice Chairman Gail Clark in the County Administration Conference Room of the County Administration Building.

Members Present: Clark, Adams, DeBernard, O'Hara and McClevey

Members Absent: Coen and Hunt

Staff Present: Baker, Lott and Keyes

1. Call to Order

Mrs. Clark called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. She stated Mr. Coen would not be attending because he was running a fever. She welcomed Craig DeBernard as a new member to the Committee and asked all members and staff to go around the table and introduce themselves. After the introductions Mrs. Clark stated the election of officers had been deferred from the last meeting because there were only four members present. She stated there were two missing and asked Mrs. Baker if they should hold elections or defer again.

2. Organization of Committee

- Election of Officers

Mrs. Baker stated it was up to the committee. After a brief discussion, the committee decided to move forward with elections. Mrs. Baker asked for nominations for Chairman.

Mr. Adams nominated Tom Coen and Mr. O'Hara seconded. With no other nominations Mrs. Baker closed the nominations and called for the vote. The nomination passed 5 to 0 (Mr. Coen and Mr. Hunt were absent). She stated since Mr. Coen was not present she would open the floor for nominations for Vice Chairman.

Mrs. Clark nominated Jeff Adams for Vice Chairman. Mrs. Baker asked if there were any other nominations. Hearing none the nominations were closed. She called for the vote for Jeff Adams as Vice Chairman. The nomination passed 5 to 0 (Mr. Coen and Mr. Hunt were absent). Mrs. Baker stated Mike Neuhard was the official secretary in the past as the administrator and stated the Committee could keep staff as the official secretary and the taking of minutes. She then handed the meeting over to Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams stated he would like to change the agenda and allow Mr. Keyes to do the development right valuation first. Everyone agreed.

- 2012 Work Plan

Discussed after Development Rights Valuation

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

5. Unfinished Business

- Development Rights Valuation

Mr. Adams stated he read an article in the Free Lance-Star concerning the property taxes in Stafford County and agricultural properties on average dropped eleven per cent. He stated his personal valuation was down about fifty per cent from the high point to current.

Mr. Keyes stated that was correct for properties like his. He stated he developed a spread sheet and passed it out. He explained he tried to keep it simple.

While the information was being passed out Mrs. Baker explained the discussion was going to be about the payment per development right when the Committee did another round. She stated currently the amount was thirty thousand dollars per development right, which was more or less equal to a three acre lot in the A-1 zone and a 1 acre lot in the A-2 zone, after subtracting wetlands, perennial streams and steep slopes and right-of-way. She stated based on the difference in land value from 2009 to current, the Committee was trying to decide if a new amount should be assigned per development right. She stated Mr. Keyes is from the Commissioner's office and was knowledgeable about land values.

Mr. Keyes stated the amount that is paid is determined by the Committee. He would be providing information and help with research of sales so the Committee could determine the number for the value of a development unit. He explained the handout and stated he captured the sales price of three to six acre lots. He explained the same sales price would be seen several times and most of those were multi-lot sales but he broke it down to cost per acre. He also showed the average and the median off to the side and sorted then low to high. He stated the lots were finished and ready for development and by finished he meant they had a drainfield site and access to the property. A building permit could be obtained for the house to be built. It was not raw farm land with no access. He stated this information would give a starting point as to what a builder would pay a developer for the property, which leads into how the amount of the development right would be worth. He stated last time the process of what A-1 land went through before it was a finished lot was considered. He explained someone owns a sizable piece of property and it is purchased by a developer. The developer then sells the finished lots to the home builder and that is where the Committee would see the sales price and sometimes in groups of 4 or 5 lots. He stated each time the value of the property increased and explained the property owner sells the property to the developer at a wholesale price and the developer sells the property to the builder at a retail price. He stated last time it was approximately a fifty per cent change each time and gave examples but feels based on information he received in talking to a developer that may be decreased now. He stated he did not break it down to a cost per acre because the PDR Committee based their number on the per lot cost. He also stated when a developer purchases a piece of property he has an idea of the development potential of the property. They do not blindly buy 100 acres of A-1 with no idea of the number of homes that can be built and they know the cost of developing raw land to a finished lot is approximately thirty thousand dollars per lot. He stated during the discussion last time the Committee said if the developer pays half of what the finished lot would be sold for, the Committee would pay half of that because they were not buying the land and the rights, just the rights. He stated there were also other comparables, such as what other localities paid. He said he thought the next step would be to decide what the number would be per development right and he would do any other studies the Committee requested and come back to another meeting.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. Adams asked where the market was when the Committee came up with the current thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. Keyes stated 3 acre lot sales were approximately twenty to thirty thousand dollars higher per lot at that time. He stated on the information he passed out, it shows a 6 acre lot was one hundred and seventy thousand dollars as the high. He stated in the Commissioner of the Revenue's office they typically use the median and the median on the information passed out was ninety-two five. The median was probably more like one-twenty or one-thirty with a few high one and he remembers them being as high as two hundred and two-twenty for 3 acre lots. He stated the grouping on the higher side of one-twenties were off of Stefaniga Road with bigger houses which would draw more money. He said the highs were much more extreme last time but the median was around one-thirtyish.

Mr. Adams asked if in general property has gone down twenty per cent in value in the Ag land, could you just use that same formula and say twenty-four thousand or was the math more complicated to get the valuation?

Mr. Keyes stated he did not think it had to be any more complicated than that. Last time the Committee decided that finished lots were selling at one-twenty, the developer bought it for half of that and the PDR Committee would pay half of that and it was done as a fairly simple approach.

Mr. Adams stated based on that half of a hundred was fifty and half of fifty that would be twenty-five and the other way was twenty-four.

Mr. Keyes stated it was up to the Committee to decide on what they felt comfortable with. He stated the Committee also considered what Fauquier was paying last time and he was asked to do a study comparing the difference in a 3 acre lot in Stafford and a 3 acre lot in Fauquier. He stated that was a little difficult because Fauquier had different rules about splitting lots, but it was determined it was close. He stated he used southern Fauquier where it adjoins Hartwood and found lot sales values were not really different. The thought of using the neighbors' number of thirty thousand was not a bad plan and it matched what we had determined.

Mrs. Baker confirmed that Fauquier has dropped and is using twenty-five currently and they do not anticipate that increasing any time soon.

Mr. Adams stated based on the numbers, you would have a hard time recommending to stay at thirty thousand.

Mr. Keyes agreed but stated he could not tell the Committee what number to pick but logic does show that things have gone down.

Mrs. Baker asked if the Committee had any additional questions for Mr. Keyes.

Mr. Adams stated the discussion confirmed the thirty thousand dollars price had to be reduced at this time and could go back up in the future.

Mrs. Baker stated based on the Ordinance and the guidelines, the valuation would be reassessed each time the Committee would go through a program round. She stated hopefully the program round

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

would start the end of this year or most likely the beginning of next year. And the number that is being discussed today is for that program round.

Mr. Keyes stated that assessments have come out two times since the thirty thousand dollars was set and both times there was a decrease and he thought the Committee was on track. He also stated if the Committee wanted to wait a few months to see if there was an upswing in the spring and he could re-evaluate in June if the Committee was not pressed for time and they were comfortable about the method that was going to be used and then just get a fresh look at the sales, he would be glad to come back with a sales update. Then you would see if there are any signs of staying the same, increasing or decreasing before the final number is set.

Mr. Adams stated the only thing the Committee had to do, if they decided to do it was to pick a new dollar figure, everything else was in place.

Mrs. Baker stated it was up to the Committee if they wanted to re-evaluate how the methodology was done. If everyone was comfortable with the methodology it would not have to be changed, just the dollar amount.

Mr. Adams asked if the Committee was going to advertise by November would the dollar figure have to be decided by August.

Mrs. Baker stated by the time it was ready to be released to the public, the Committee would do another informational session and another mailing to the property owners of greater than 20 acres, that is when the it would have to be decided.

Mrs. Clark asked if it needed Board approval.

Mrs. Baker stated it would probably be presented to the Board, it does not necessarily have to be approved by them, but it would go to them more for informational purposes.

Mr. Adams stated since Mr. Keyes cannot recommend a figure to the Committee, could he advise if the thought the figure was too high or about right.

Mr. Keys stated because these do not buy and sell on the open market, he would have no better way of advising other than the knowledge the Committee already has. At some point it just gets to be an opinion. He stated he was involved in the process last time and he thought it made sense and was logical the way the figure was decided and he did not see anything wrong with using the same process this time.

Mr. O'Hara stated he thought the important part was looking at solving the problem multiple ways and if you keep coming back to the same answer, you would be pretty close. He stated there were already two mathematical models that gave close to the same number. Then you would look at the market with Fauquier being the only close market and if they are using twenty-five then the answer is probably twenty-five. You will not know if you are wrong until you put it out and if people don't put up their property you would get the answer.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. Adams stated based on the way he came up with twenty-four and twenty-five and the fact that Fauquier is twenty-five, the average is twenty-four six.

Mrs. Clark stated she felt she would be on the side of the property owner and go with twenty-five. She stated it seems obvious that twenty-five or something close to that was more appropriate. She stated she does believe that building has increased but it was probably existing lots and purchased some time ago.

Mr. Keys stated based on the current sales the cost was not surprisingly low, but raw land is where the market is hurting. In his opinion there is a lot of property that got to the lot division stage, not just 3 acre lots, but quarter acre lots also, and there is a big supply of ready to go lots. There is not very much demand for raw farm land and the purchase price where the developer would go to the farmer and try to buy the land would still be very low. But if it is developed and he has been sitting for five years waiting for the builder. The builders are starting to get back into the game. It will take some time before the raw land value goes up.

Mr. O'Hara stated there was a lot of risk taking raw land because it does not get any easier over time.

Mr. Keyes stated the developer he spoke to was sitting on some property and he would love to sell it in the raw, the lots and perc sites have been approved, but there are no roads. And rather than put up the money he would rather sell it but there is nobody willing to take that risk because there are plenty of finished lots out there where they can buy five at a time that has curb and gutter and the sewer line stubbed up. Because of that the 3 acre raw land market is suffering.

Mr. O'Hara stated the question would be how much back log and how many lots are purchased per year and that would tell you how many years it would take to see a change in raw land value.

Mr. Keys stated there were many lots out there and some were quarter-acre lots which was a different type of product. In his opinion because proffers got kind of high it caused developers to go to the A-1 area and cut up a farm and put houses there rather than develop a R-1 property into quarter-acre lots. It is almost reversed, there are plenty of R-1 lots that are ready to go and maybe some proffers to pay and the A-1 properties have slowed down.

Mrs. Baker stated it was up to the Committee, if they were not ready to make a decision on the cost there was time. She suggested they keep it in mind as to how they wanted to do it and make the determination.

Mr. Adams stated he had no problem voting on twenty-five tonight, because in his opinion that is where it needed to be.

Mr. O'Hara stated the only reason he would table it was because two members were not present and thought symbolically it would be good if the Committee as a whole voted.

Mr. McClevey asked if there were developers that were sitting on large parcels of land that might want to get into PDR and then taking tax credits for the loss. Was there any incentive for developers to want to reduce property rather than sit on it?

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. Keyes stated in the last application process there was a developer that submitted and wanted to convert the property to PDR. Even though the real estate market has improved some he did not think A-1 raw land has improved dramatically. He said he thought it was a very good possibility a developer would throw his application in at either amount that the Committee picked.

Mr. Adams stated last time Mr. Silver was willing to kick in an extra lot or two because there was no incentive for him to sell twenty and have another two floating. He stated a developer might do that too, but there comes a point where he does not think a developer will kick in lots eight, ten or twelve lots. He would just give up a certain section like last time. The developer was not giving up the whole property he was giving up a section within the total project.

Mr. Keyes stated as time goes on developers that are in trouble or have the potential to lose their property or just walk away from it because it is no longer worth it to them, in his opinion most of those properties have already been turned over. He stated they saw that happen quite regularly for a while but not lately.

Mrs. Clark asked Mrs. Baker if the matching funds were still in the farmland protection pot.

Mrs. Bakers stated yes and in order to meet their criteria the Committee would have to show that the land is being used for agricultural or suitable for agricultural.

Mrs. Clark asked if silviculture was included. Mrs. Baker responded yes.

Mr. McClevey asked if the land use had to change once the land had been cleared for lots.

Mrs. Baker stated not necessarily, if they have not sold as lots.

Mr. Keyes stated as far as the land use program if they harvest the timber and do not do anything to replant or regenerate the timber that could take it out of land use. He stated a forestry plan was required at one time, but he thought that had changed a bit and he did not know the exact guidelines, but they had to be growing timber.

Mr. Adams stated he discussed a program with Ron Wisnewski and he understood the land had to be actively farmed.

Mrs. Baker stated that was the federal program, the Farm and Ranch Lands program.

Mr. McClevey stated he thought when Sarah Richardson came up from Farm Land it was stated that if it was close it would be okay. If it was not exactly pasture land, but it had some farm or old farm activities they would be agreeable if it fit the PDR program.

Mrs. Baker stated that was correct and the PDR program does have the piece where it requires good soils. So you are going to have some leeway there. If you have a property that has terrible soils and it is not conducive to farming that may be a different story. She stated everything in Stafford was developable and the Committee was excluding wet soils and steep slopes.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. McClevey stated he agreed with Mr. O'Hara and it should be deferred to allow the other members to be present or wait like Mr. Keyes suggested and sit on it to see how the real estate market goes.

Mr. O'Hara asked if there was a deadline for the decision.

Mrs. Baker stated there was not a deadline. The money the Committee had now from the current roll-back taxes and the State matching funds there was only one hundred and thirty-four thousand dollars, which was not enough to do a round. By the end of the fiscal year, which was June 30th the Committee would know what the potential money would be for our portion and go for more matching funds in October. Then if there was enough at that point to go for another round in January of next year the Committee would have one year to complete the process, the funds would need to be expended by the end of 2013. She stated the Committee would need to get serious by summertime when the total money amount was known then the amount per development right could go out to the public.

Mr. Adams asked if the information concerning the roll-back taxes would be known by the 15th of August.

Mrs. Baker stated the Committee should have an idea by the end of June. Last year it was August.

Mr. Keyes stated the good and the bad of that is the fewer properties that are developed, the less roll back taxes there are.

Mr. Adams stated if the Committee had the information by August they could apply for matching funds from the State which could increase the amount to two hundred and fifty thousand and if there was something else that would match the two hundred and fifty thousand, they could be up to three hundred thousand real quick.

Mrs. Clark stated unfortunately the only money the Committee received was over and above what the County has budgeted.

Mr. McClevey asked if it made a difference from fiscal year to fiscal year as far as how they want to allocate the funds.

Mrs. Baker stated the Board can at any time they go through the budget cycle opt to give more money to the program or take it away and they are talking budget right now. The budget public hearing is scheduled for April 4th. She stated there was a big shortfall this year due to schools having to make up money so not likely anything above and beyond schools and public safety will get additional money.

Mr. McClevey asked if the tax rate had been established.

Mrs. Baker stated no, the tax rate will also be set at that time.

Mrs. Clark stated because fuel is rising it would be difficult to pay for anything other than fuel for school buses and public safety.

Mr. Adams thanked Mr. Keyes for the information.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. Keyes stated it sounded like the Committee wanted to set this item aside and he would pull sales studies and come back at a later time

Mrs. Baker stated in the meantime the Committee would make sure they were going to keep the methodology the same or if there was anything else they intended to change before they get to the point they are ready to roll out a new program. She thanked Mr. Keyes also. She asked the Committee if they would like to take a vote on what they wanted to do with this item.

Mrs. Clark made a motion to table the discussion until the next meeting. Mr. McClevey seconded the motion. The motion passed 5 to 0 (Mr. Coen and Mr. Hunt were absent).

2. *Organization of Committee*

- *2012 Work Plan*

Mr. Adams stated the next item on the agenda would be the 2012 work plan, which included the farmers market, PDR which we decided to put off for a little bit and, Chesapeake Bay and education outreach.

Mrs. Baker stated these were the ideas that came out of the last meeting. She asked if there were any additions or changes and stated it could certainly change as the year goes.

Mr. Adams asked if it was a foregone conclusion there would be some type of ordinance for farmers market of some kind.

Mrs. Baker stated it was hard to say at this time. Nobody has had any serious concerns about it. It was scheduled for a public hearing at the Planning Commission March 23rd but it would be June before it goes to the Board. She stated the Committee could certainly discuss how they wanted to proceed as time permits in the next two or three agendas how the guidelines would be set up. She stated the Committee may want to set up a sub-committee to be working on certain aspects. But it certainly could be discussed and get more into the details as it gets closer to the Board.

Mr. Adams asked Mrs. Baker if she could send him an email the Monday before the meeting as a reminder. He stated he did not mind being there or speaking to the Planning Commission. He stated he spoke with Mr. Hirons at Ferry Farm one day when he had the oxen out there and in his opinion he was rather excited about getting something going on the market.

Mrs. Baker stated that the items on the work plan are not in prioritized order.

3. *Approval of Minutes – January 23, 2012 minutes*

Mr. Adams stated the next item was the approval of last month's minutes. There were four in attendance and asked if anybody had any comments.

Mr. McClevey made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Clark seconded. With no discussion Mr. Adams called for the vote. The motion passed 3-0-2 (Mr. O'Hara and Mr. DeBernard abstained) (Mr. Coen and Mr. Hunt were absent).

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

4. Staff Update

Mr. Adams asked Mrs. Baker if she had any information concerning the farmers' market ordinance.

- Farmers Market Ordinance

Mrs. Baker stated she basically updated the Committee when discussing the work plan. She stated she would keep everyone informed on any changes, recommendations or issues that might come up concerning the March 21st public hearing.

Mr. Adams asked if the Board sent it back without changes.

Mrs. Baker stated there was no discussion.

Mr. DeBernard asked if there were any ideas about the location of the market.

Mrs. Baker stated this is just setting the stage for it.

Mrs. Clark stated the County was probably not going to run the first one. It would be someone who decides to organize it.

Mrs. Baker stated she would send Mr. DeBernard a copy of the ordinance and would talk with him in further detail concerning the ordinance and how the Committee got to this point or he was welcome to come into the office and they could sit down.

Mr. Adams stated he wanted to ask the Committee if they would like him to go and speak in favor of the farmers market as a Committee member or just answer any questions asked of him.

Mrs. Clark stated it was public comment and in her opinion he should say something.

After a brief discussion it was decided Mr. Adams would speak on behalf of the Committee.

- Chesapeake Bay/Total Maximum Daily Loads

Mr. Adams stated that would bring them to TMDL. He stated about a month ago he met with Ron Wisnewski concerning his contract and work at his farm. He brought up the TMDL discussion and Mr. Wisnewski said a couple of things. First was he had seen some figures regarding the number of dairy cows and beef cows and he knows those numbers are incorrect. He stated even through the Freedom of Information Act we do not have access because it is private property. He said Mr. Wisnewski could only give general information.

Mr. Lott asked what organization Mr. Wisnewski was with.

Mr. Adams stated Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) under the USDA and he works with Leslie Clark. He stated they know what is in the area but they can't give us a spread sheet with names and numbers.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mr. Lott stated he spoke with Scott Mayausky, the Commissioner of the Revenue, about trying to come up with a data base. He stated Mr. Mayausky would have someone get the information he was requesting. So he should get that process started within the next month and they will generate some sort of spread sheet of what people have filled out on their land use applications.

Mrs. Clark stated he would still need best management practices and that would come from soil and water.

Mr. Lott stated he had a discussion with Mrs. Baker today concerning sending a letter out explaining the TMDL process and that it is thought that farmers are doing more than they are being credited for and ask them if they are willing to share information. He stated people may not do it. He stated it is State Law that has not been enforced for a long time. He stated he wanted to be preemptive and introduce this is going on rather than knocking on farmers doors unannounced.

Mr. DeBernard stated that would probably be a good idea. He stated when people sign up for land use they have to check what they are doing.

Mrs. Clark stated you are not required to put anything about BMPs.

Mr. Adams stated you have to have so many animal units to qualify. He has so many animals on his 38-acre farm that he is super qualified and does not list everything.

Mrs. Baker stated maybe a different approach instead of just sending something out and saying tell me what you have got. She suggested starting the educational process on this now and have an information session and send letters to the landowners explaining what is going to be happening and ask them to come and listen. Explain we want everyone to be aware of what is going on and build a rapport first.

Mrs. Clark stated if we could catalogue what is going on now perhaps the Federal Government would stay out of our hair, and say that with a different twist. And say we feel farmers are part of the solution, not part of the problem and we want to see what you are doing. She suggested it should be done in a positive way, simple and quick.

Mr. Lott stated he did not want detailed information.

Mrs. Clark agreed and stated he only needed to document what was being done in the county. She stated there was also some discussion in the past of the possibility of using some fund to help finance another Soil and Water position to start management audits.

Mr. Lott stated that is what was required in the Chesapeake Bay Act. No one has done them and no one has checked to see that they are done.

Mrs. Clark stated she agreed with Mrs. Baker, if you put a positive spin on it the response might be better.

Mr. Lott stated he will try to have a spreadsheet to discuss with the Committee at the next meeting.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mrs. Clark asked about the time table.

Mr. Lott stated Steve Hubble, the Environmental Programs Manager has submitted information to the State and currently he is waiting for feedback. He stated they will continue to try to build a relationship with Tri-County and see if they had any information to share. And he would capture as much information as possible.

Mr. McClevey asked about the implementation of the Phase 2. He stated it states review of existing local land use data versus land use data in the Chesapeake Bay model and asked Mr. Lott to explain.

Mrs. Baker stated part of that was the inputs they had that was presented to the Committee a couple of month prior which stated the number of sheep and cattle.

Mrs. Clark stated real data needed to be collected versus what they have.

Mr. Lott stated he did not know when they listed land use data if that was the same as land use within the County.

Mrs. Baker stated not the land use program but what is the use of the land.

Mr. Lott stated how much is commercial, residential or agricultural and he can obtain that information off of the GIS systems.

Mr. Adams stated there were a lot of people that had livestock or some type of farming activity on their property, but the property is not in land use either because it does not qualify or they choose not to do it.

Mrs. Baker stated based on the numbers from the State and saying the county is producing this much pollution towards the Bay is a little skewed, because that much is not coming from agriculture if you look at it from the numbers being too high.

Mr. Adams stated in his opinion when you do something like an education program the turn out still is not all that great.

Mrs. Baker stated it may not be a session, it might be a mailer that gives information as to what is going on and you can find more information here. And include a survey and explain we would appreciate their help. She stated it was just a start.

Mr. DeBernard suggested the possibility of including a short questionnaire with the land use information.

Mrs. Baker stated staff would talk with Mr. Mayausky.

Mrs. Clark stated that would only give you land use people and there were a lot of backyard chickens and things like that. She suggested pulling together little groups and have them list names of people in the area that farm or that have animals.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

Mrs. Baker stated she would ask at the PDR Managers group and see how they are dealing with it.

6. Next Meeting

- March 26, 2012 Regular Meeting

Mr. Adams stated the next meeting is scheduled March 26th.

After a brief discussion concerning the meeting returning to Monday night Mrs. Baker asked the Committee which items they would like to discuss at the next meeting.

Mrs. Clark stated since it would be after the Planning Commission meeting the Committee would know the decision concerning farmers market.

Mrs. Baker stated she would keep farmers market on the agenda. She stated she did not see any issues.

Mr. McClevey stated he wanted to add that Virginia Agriculture had a license plate but there was an annual fee and the money was used for farm preservation.

Mr. Adams stated the picture on the plate was an actual farm in Orange County.

Mrs. Clark stated National Ag Week is March 4 through 11.

Mrs. Baker asked Mrs. Clark if she had any information that could be posted on the web.

Mr. Adams asked Mrs. Clark if they were going to read again this year.

Mrs. Clark stated she would be going to Mountain View high school on Tuesday and H. H. Poole middle school on Thursday to talk to the consumer ed and culinary arts classes. She would be going to a health fair at Garrisonville Elementary in May to talk about healthy eating.

Mr. Adams stated Mountain View wanted to put in raised beds.

Mrs. Clark stated she thought Denise Baxter in culinary arts may want to team up with them. She stated she was trying to schedule something with Hartwood Elementary concerning reading. The book, Our Fields to You is about green beans and sweet corn is about a vegetable farm in southwest Virginia. She stated she wants to increase that and also talk about field corn and soy beans. She stated she was not sure it was going to work and if it did she would contact Mr. Adams. She told Mrs. Baker she did not have anything for the web site.

Mr. McClevey stated he sent a note to Nan Rollison to see if she could come up with a John Deere tractor riding across the County web page. He stated he would see what she says.

7. Adjournment

Mr. Adams stated if there was no further business the meeting is adjourned.

***AGRICULTURAL AND PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT
RIGHTS COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2012***

With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.